content-adding logic, coupled to the control logic, operative to provide the additional content or an identifier of said additional content to the client system if the additional content is to be provided.

20. (deleted)

21. (Twice Amended) The bridge server of claim [20] 19, wherein the identifier comprises a Uniform Resource Locators (URL).

29. (Twice Amended) A client system comprising:

control logic operative to transmit a request that targets a network server and to re-transmit the request in a marked up form, upon receiving return of the request, from a bridge server, in said marked up form marked up by said [from a] bridge server.

REMARKS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated November 26, 2001, in the above-identified application. All the pending claims are rejected by the Examiner in the office action under either 35 USC §102 over Simmons (USP 5,974,451), Van Hoff (USP 5,822,539), Haserodt (USP 6,031,836) or under 35 USC §103 over their combination with Rondeau (USP 5,850,433). The applicants have further amended the independent claims 1, 19 and 29 to more clearly define the invention, as well as the dependent claims 4, 11, 17 and 21 for consistency with the amended independent claims. In addition, the applicants also have deleted independent claims 10 and 20 for consistency with the above amendment. The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections based on the amended claims.

As defined in the amended independent claims 1 and 19, a patentably distinguishing feature of the present invention is that the bridge server determines or checks the additional content in response to the received request for content targeting a network server. In other words, the

determination of the additional content is carried out by the bridge server upon receiving the request of content, but not after the bridge server receives the content from the targeted network server. This distinguishing feature is fully supported throughout the original specification of the application, e.g., lines 7-12, page 7 and lines 17-22, page 8. Thus, the determination of the additional content is made solely based on the information contained in the request, but not the content from the targeted network server since the determination is made before the bridge server receives the content.

This feature makes the present invention as defined in the amended independent claims 1 and 19 distinguishable from Simmons patent (USP 5,974,451). In the claims of Simmons, the bulletin server retrieves the bulletin in response to receiving the information from the wide area computer network. Therefore, the determination of the bulletin is carried out after the bridge server receives the requested information (content) but not on the request itself. With the Simmons patent, the determination of the bulletin is carried out based on the information received from the computer network, but not solely on the request itself as taught by the present invention. This is clearly described throughout its specification (e.g., in lines 31 – 41, column 5). Therefore, the Simmons patent does not claim the present invention and thus, an interference would be improper. Furthermore, the Simmons patent does not qualify as a reference under 35 USC §102(e) due to the affidavit that the applicants filed on March 12, 2001. In addition, it shall be appreciated that the present invention is not anticipated in the disclosure of Simmons as it can not be found anywhere in Simmons that the determination of the bulletin (additional content) is carried out in response to the request received at the bridge server.

Van Hoff (USP 5,822,539) discloses a technique in which annotation is provided and merged by an annotation proxy server to a document received from a web server requested by a client computer. The annotation (supplemental information) is applied after the document is received at

the annotation proxy server (see lines 32-37). Therefore, the annotation is not determined in response to the request for a document since the proxy server has to rely on the document to determine the annotation. In fact, the annotation proxy server only needs to receive the document, merge the annotation to the document, and then forward it to the client computer. The proxy server does not need to receive the request itself, especially when it is remotely located. Therefore, the applicants believe that the amended claims 1 and 19 are not anticipated by van Hoff and are thus patentable. At least for the same reasons, their pending dependent claims 2-3, 5-9, 11, 13-18 and 21-23 are also patentable.

Same as the independent claim 24 that remains unchanged this time, the amended independent claim 29 now also clearly defines a distinguishing feature that the request in mark up form is marked up by said bridge server. This is fully supported in the original specification (e.g., line 10, page 13). This feature can not be found anywhere in Haserodt (USP 6,031,836), in which a form is provided from a server to a user, and is returned to the server after the user marks up the form (i.e., making selection or filling in the form). In Haserodt, the form is marked by the user (client computer) and then sent back to the server (see line 67, col. 3 to line 5, col. 4). There is no other server such as the bridge server involved in marking the form. Therefore, the applicants assert that independent claims 24 and 29 are not anticipated by Haserodt and are thus patentable. At least for the same reasons, their dependent claims 25 and 30 are also patentable.

It is also believed that none of the independent claims 1, 19, 24 and 29 are anticipated by Rondeau (USP 5,850,433), or are obvious in view of its combination with Haserodt and/or van Hoff. Indeed, even if the combinations suggested by the Examiner were obvious, since the features pointed out above are absent from all the references, the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejections should be

withdrawn. In summary, no reference shows or claims the use of a server to mark the request by annotating the client content in response the request itself.

The applicants believe the application is in good condition for allowance, and thus respectfully request further examination based on the amendment and remarks as above. Any fees believed due should be charged to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

KAPLAN & GILMAN, L.L.P.
900 Route 9 North
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Telephone (732) 634-7634

DATED: January 10, 2002

Jeffrey I. Kaplan
(Reg. No. 34,356)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal service as first class mail, in a postage prepaid envelope, addressed to Box Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on January 10, 2002.

Dated January 10, 2002 Signed Paula M. Halsey Print Name Paula M. Halsey

REPLACEMENT PAGES OF AMENDED
CLAIMS 1, 4, 11, 17, 19, 21 AND 29

(IN CLEAN VERSION)

1. (Thrice Amended) In a bridge server, a method comprising:

receiving by said bridge server from a client system a request for content targeting a network server, and

determining by said bridge server, in response to said received request, additional content, in addition to the requested content to be provided to the client system by the network server; and

providing by said bridge server said determined additional content or an identifier of said additional content to said client system.

4. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said determining comprises checking by said bridge server whether additional content corresponding to said network server exists.

11. (Twice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein the identifier of the additional content comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) corresponding to the additional content.

17. (Thrice Amended) The method of claim 1, wherein said providing comprises returning by said bridge server a HyperText Markup Language (HTML) page to the client system, wherein the HTML page includes said identifier of the additional content for the client system to retrieve the additional content.

19. (Thrice Amended) A bridge server comprising:

control logic operative to receive a request for content from a client system targeting